

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/046,283

Applicant(s)

PARK, HUN GUN

Examiner

Laurel E LeFlore

Art Unit

2673

All Participants:

(1) Laurel E LeFlore.

(2) Laura Lee.

Status of Application: amended after non-final rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9 February 2004

Time: 4:57 p.m.

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1-9. Possible rejection of newly added claims 10-20.

Claims discussed:

1-20

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

JOSEPH MANCUSO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

In regard to newly added claims 10-20, claim 10 (independent) is broad but could be allowable over prior art if all of claims 14-17 were added into claim 10. However, previous 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-9 also applies to claims 10-20 and has not been overcome by applicant's arguments. It is suggested that paragraph [06] of the specification discloses driving ICs that would overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejection if they also could be used to drive the immediate invention, not just the prior art.